

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 5, 11 - 15, and 21 - 25 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended. Claims 6 - 10, 16 - 20, and 26 - 30 have been cancelled.

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 26, and 27 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Chu et al. in view of Lee and Segnan. Claims 6, 7, 16, 17, 26, and 27 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to include “generating executable code to locate objects in said map container objects that are identified by said keys, wherein said executable code is executed after said compiling or interpreting said source code”.

The Applicant agrees with the Examiner that neither Chu nor Lee teach or suggest compiling or interpreting source code as set forth in the claims. The Examiner introduces Segnan as disclosing a compiler to generate executable code from source code that searches a table for an assigned identifier. However, Segnan does not teach that the executable code searches a table for an assigned identifier. All the searching is done by the compiler, not the generated code. The generated code uses pointers and unique identifiers (integers), and does no searching. It will be appreciated that all compilers generate executable code from source code, and all compilers search tables for identifiers. However, the claims recite “generating executable code to locate objects in said map container objects that are identified by said keys, wherein *said executable code is executed after said compiling or interpreting* said source code”, emphasis added.

Accordingly, neither Chu, Lee, nor Segnan teach or suggest “generating executable code to locate objects in said map container objects that are identified by said keys, wherein said executable code is executed after said compiling or interpreting said source code”. For these reasons, Applicant submits that claims 1, 11 and 21 patentably define over Chu et al. in view of Lee and Segnan. Claims 2 - 5, 12 - 15, and 22 - 25 all also patentable as depending from the aforementioned independent claims. In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 - 5, 11 - 15, and 21 - 25 are respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 8, 9, 13, 14, 18, 19, 23, 24, 28, and 29 stand rejected as being unpatentable over Chu et al. in view of Lee and Allard et al. Claims 8, 9, 18, 19, 28, and 29

have been cancelled. Claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 23, and 24 should be allowable as depending from what should now be allowable independent claims (as discussed hereinabove). Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of claims 3, 4, 13, 14, 23, and 24 are respectfully requested.

It is believed that the foregoing remarks fully comply with the Office Action. Therefore, having traversed the Examiner's rejections, reexamination and allowance of claims 1 - 5, 11 - 15, and 21 - 25 is respectfully requested.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Amendment or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

THEODORE S. HILLS

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

Applicant's Attorneys

By: 

Philmore H. Colburn II

Registration No. 35,101

Date: January 27, 2004

Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929